



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/648,595	08/25/2003	Richard Harvey	063170.6609	4259
5073	7590	07/26/2006	EXAMINER	
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P. 2001 ROSS AVENUE SUITE 600 DALLAS, TX 75201-2980			LEWIS, ALICIA M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2164	

DATE MAILED: 07/26/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/648,595	<b>Applicant(s)</b> HARVEY ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Alicia M. Lewis	<b>Art Unit</b> 2164	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 5/31/2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.



**SAM RIMELL**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### DETAILED ACTION

This office action is responsive to communication filed May 31, 2006. Claim 8 has been amended, and all other claims remain in original form. Therefore, claims 1-14 are pending in this application.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gadbois et al. (US Patent Application Publication 2004/0002955 A1) ('Gadbois') in view of Cutlip (US Patent Application Publication 2004/0039738 A1).

With respect to claims 1 and 8, Gadbois teaches:

arranging business entity object(s) under user object(s) (elements 222, 224, 232, 242 and 252 in Figure 2, paragraphs 27-29).

Although Gadbois discloses tModel identifiers being included in keyed reference data, he does not explicitly teach arranging corresponding tModel object(s) under at least one of user object(s), repository object and prefix.

Cutlip teaches implementing geographical taxonomy within network-accessible service registries using spatial extensions (see abstract) in which he teaches arranging corresponding tModel object(s) under at least one of user object(s), repository object and prefix (paragraphs 40-41).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Gadbois by the teaching of Cutlip because arranging corresponding tModel object(s) under at least one of user object(s), repository object and prefix would enable tModel type data to be used to point to technical definitions (i.e., interface specifications) for a registered service, thus serving as “technical fingerprints” to identify services (Cutlip, paragraph 41).

With respect to claims 2 and 9, Gadbois as modified teaches further comprising arranging publisher assertion object(s) under business entity object(s) (Gadbois, elements 222, 224, 252, 254, 282 and 284 in Figure 2, paragraphs 28-29).

With respect to claims 3 and 10, Gadbois as modified teaches further comprising providing service projection object(s) under business entity object(s) (Gadbois, elements 222, 224, 242, 243, 244, 272 and 274 in Figure 2, paragraph 28).

With respect to claims 4 and 11, Gadbois as modified teaches wherein the service projection object(s) is implemented as an alias (Gadbois, elements 242, 243, 244, 245 and 246 in Figure 2, paragraphs 28 and 29).

With respect to claims 5 and 12, Gadbois as modified teaches further comprising first field(s) as attributes of publisher assertion object(s) (Gadbois, elements 254 and 284 in Figure 2, paragraph 33).

Gadbois teaches that publisher assertion names (PublisherAssertion1 and PublisherAssertion2) and publisher names (Publisher1 and Publisher2) are attributes of publisher assertion object(s).

With respect to claims 6 and 13, Gadbois as modified teaches further comprising representing a keyed reference by an auxiliary class (Gadbois, paragraphs 38-39).

Gadbois discloses that a fromKey, toKey, and keyedReference are all included when publisher assertions are added to a directory information tree (DIT). One having ordinary skill in the art recognizes that these included attributes represent an auxiliary class because they are added to publisher assertion objects instances rather than to the entire class of objects.

With respect to claims 7 and 14, Gadbois as modified teaches further comprising providing a distinguished name of an object revealing a chain of ownership and control for the object (Gadbois, Figure 2, paragraphs 27-29).

***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 8 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alicia M. Lewis whose telephone number is 571-272-5599. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 9 - 6:30, alternate Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on 571-272-4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Alicia Lewis  
July 17, 2006

  
**SAM RIMELL**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**